

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

United States of America,) Cr. No. 3:09-826 (CMC)
)
 v.) **OPINION and ORDER**
)
 Clint Anthony Walker,)
)
 Defendant.)
 _____)

This matter is before the court on Defendant's Motion to compel the Government to file a Rule 35 motion. ECF No. 1155.

Under Rule 35(b), the decision to move for reduction of sentence is solely in the discretion of the Government. The district court is without authority to compel such a motion unless Defendant can show that his cooperation is complete, and that the Government breached the plea agreement or that the Government's failure to file resulted from an unconstitutional motive or was not rationally related to a legitimate government goal. *Wade v. United States*, 504 U.S. 181, 185-86 (1992); *United States v. Butler*, 272 F.3d 683, 686 (4th Cir. 2001). Defendant must make a "substantial threshold showing," *Wade*, 504 U.S. at 186, of either of these elements which should constitute more than a recitation of the assistance provided.

Defendant has made no showing of any change in circumstances since the last time he filed a motion to compel. Indeed, the motions are identical except for the date signed by Defendant. *See* ECF Nos. 1095 & 10055. Defendant has not provided any evidence of a breach of the plea agreement by the Government, nor has he made a “substantial threshold showing” relating to either element noted

above. Therefore, Defendant's motion is **denied**.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie

CAMERON McGOWAN CURRIE

SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina

July 11, 2014

¹The court notes that the Government previously declined to file a motion for relief under Rule 35(b) due to its assertion of Defendant's breach of the plea agreement. *See* Resp. in Opp. to Mot. to Compel, ECF No. 1099.